



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/774,954	02/09/2004	W. Paul Willes	23839-11592	8643

758	7590	09/12/2007
FENWICK & WEST LLP SILICON VALLEY CENTER 801 CALIFORNIA STREET MOUNTAIN VIEW, CA 94041		

EXAMINER	
HERNANDEZ, NELSON D	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2622	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/12/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

gsueoka@fenwick.com
ptoc@fenwick.com
aprice@fenwick.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/774,954	Applicant(s) WILLES ET AL.	
	Examiner Nelson D. Hernandez	Art Unit 2622	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 June 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16, 18-22 and 24-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16, 18-22 and 24-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09 February 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>7/31/2007</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The Examiner acknowledges the amended claims filed on June 20, 2007.

Claims 1-16 and 18-22 have been amended. **Claims 17 and 23** have been canceled.

Claims 24-26 have been newly added.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to **claim 1** have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.
3. The Applicant argues that Manico does not disclose a mounting assembly attached to the low profile camera housing adapted for flush mounting the opening (or the glare shield) in direct contact with a transparent medium.

The Examiner disagrees. As shown in figs. 1 and 2, Manico et al. discloses a camera mounting system (See figs. 1 and 2) to mount a camera (Fig. 1: 16) to a transparent medium (window 54 as shown in fig. 1), said mounting system comprising: a low profile camera housing (because of the amendments made to the claims, the Examiner is reading the combination of the camera and the mount 10 as the camera housing as shown in fig. 1 which is a low profile camera housing) defining an opening (lens opening in mount 10 formed with a glare shield (exposure chamber 44 as shown in fig. 1 also working as a glare shield circumscribed by the opening), and wherein the mounting assembly is adapted for flush mounting the glare shield in direct contact with a

Art Unit: 2622

transparent medium for exposing the lens 34 so the camera can capture the images) and, wherein said camera receives images through the opening; and a mounting assembly (suction cups 56, 58 and 60 as shown in fig. 1) attached to the low profile camera housing and adapted for flush mounting the opening flush mount in direct contact with a transparent medium (See fig. 2, the opening formed by the exposure chamber and the glare shield is flush mounted in direct contact with the window (the exposure chamber is in direct contact to the window completely)) (Col. 1, line 48 – col. 3, line 8).

Claim Objections

4. **Claim 13** is objected to because of the following informalities: **claim 13** as amended appears to be deleting the dependency from **claim 1** but does not appear to have a new dependency. For examining purposes the claim will be read as dependent from **claim 1**. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. **Claims 1-6, 8, 9, 11, 14-16, 18, 20, 22, and 24-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Manico et al., US Patent 5,9047,330 in view of Kendrick, US Patent 6,175,300 B1 and further in view of Tashiro et al., US Patent 6,705,774 B2.**

Regarding claim 1, Manico et al. discloses a camera mounting system (See figs. 1 and 2) to mount a camera (Fig. 1: 16) to a transparent medium (window 54 as shown in fig. 1), said mounting system comprising: a low profile camera housing (the Examiner is reading the combination of the camera and the mount 10 as the camera housing as shown in fig. 1 which is a low profile camera housing) defining an opening (lens opening in mount 10 formed with a glare shield (exposure chamber 44 as shown in fig. 1 also working as a glare shield circumscribed by the opening), and wherein the mounting assembly is adapted for flush mounting the glare shield in direct contact with a transparent medium for exposing the lens 34 so the camera can capture the images) and, wherein said camera receives images through the opening; and a mounting assembly (suction cups 56, 58 and 60 as shown in fig. 1) attached to the low profile camera housing and adapted for flush mounting the opening flush mount in direct contact with a transparent medium (See fig. 2, the opening formed by the exposure

chamber and the glare shield is flush mounted in direct contact with the window) (Col. 1, line 48 – col. 3, line 8).

Manico does not explicitly disclose that the camera is a network video camera comprising an adjustable video sensor assembly, wherein the video sensor assembly receives images through said opening and is adapted for making the received images available through a network interface.

However, Kendrick discloses a video camera mounting system (See fig. 10) comprising: a low profile camera (Fig. 10: 15) housing defining an opening (opening having lens 11 as shown in fig. 10) and comprising an adjustable video sensor assembly (Fig. 10: 10; col. 5, lines 2-15; the video sensor is electronically adjusted using interface 18 as shown in fig. 9), wherein said video sensor assembly receives images through the opening and is adapted for making the received images available through an interface (the video sensor is connected to a video monitor 20 through a cable 19 as shown in figs. 10 and 11); and a mounting assembly (suction cups 16 and 17 as shown in fig. 10) attached to the low profile camera housing and adapted for flush mounting the opening with a transparent medium (glass 7 of side rear turn signal and stop lamp assembly 6 as shown in fig. 4) (Col. 5, lines 2-25).

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, one of an ordinary skill in the art would recognize the advantages of a video camera that can pan and tilt over a one time use camera and would find obvious to modify the teaching in Manico in view of Kendrick to use video camera comprising an adjustable video sensor assembly, wherein the video sensor assembly receives images through said opening and adapted for making

Art Unit: 2622

the received images available through an interface. The motivation to do so would have been to improve the operation of the camera by allowing the user to record video of a specific scene while controlling the line of sight of said video camera while receiving a life feedback.

The combined teaching of Manico in view of Kendrick fails to teach that the video camera is a network video camera and is adapted for making the received images available through a network interface.

However, Tashiro et al. discloses a network video camera (Fig. 1) comprising: a low profile camera housing (See fig. 1) defining an opening (Fig. 1: 6) and comprising an adjustable video sensor assembly (Fig. 4: 9), wherein said video sensor assembly receives images through the opening and is adapted for making the received images available through a network interface so that a user can control the camera remotely using a web browser on the internet (Fig. 9: 46) (Col. 1, lines 8-43; col. 4, lines 28-34; col. 9, lines 34-67).

Therefore, taking the combined teaching of Manico in view of Kendrick and further in view of Tashiro et al. as a whole, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Manico and Kendrick by using a network video camera adapted for making the received images available through a network interface. The motivation to do so would have been to control the camera using a browser and receive the video image on a remote location as suggested by Tashiro et al. (Col. 9, lines 47-67).

Regarding claim 2, the combined teaching of Manico in view of Kendrick and further in view of Tashiro et al. as discussed and analyzed in claim 1 teaches that said mounting assembly is connected to a mounting point located on the low profile housing (See Manico, fig. 1, suction cups are located on the low profile housing; see also Kendrick, fig. 10, suction cups are located on the low profile housing).

Regarding claim 3, claim 3 is written in a Markush type by using the expression "a connector selected from the group consisting of threads, screws, snaps, rivets, plugs, Velcro, connectors, spring material, compression material, and pins", meeting one species of a genus family anticipates the claimed subject matter. "A generic claim cannot be allowed to an applicant if the prior art discloses a species falling within the claimed genus." The species in that case will anticipate the genus. In re Slayter, 276 F.2d 408, 411, 125 USPQ 345, 347 (CCPA 1960); In re Gosteli, 872 F.2d 1008, 10 USPQ2d 1614 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Although the combined teaching of Manico in view of Kendrick and further in view of Tashiro et al. as discussed and analyzed in claim 1 does not go into the details of how the mounting point is connected to the mounting assembly, Official Notice is taken that the use of different materials such as screws, pins, threads or even glue can be used to attach suction cups to different devices so they can hold the device in place, and one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize the need of a connection means to hold the suction cups and the camera mount together in order to hold said mount in place and would recognize the different types of connection means available at the time to perform said connection.

Regarding claim 4, claim 4 is written in a Markush type by using the expression "mounting point is selected from the group consisting of a front mounting point, a side mounting point, a top mounting point, a bottom mounting point, bottom rear mounting point, a rear mounting point and a clip-on attachment point", meeting one species of a genus family anticipates the claimed subject matter. "A generic claim cannot be allowed to an applicant if the prior art discloses a species falling within the claimed genus." The species in that case will anticipate the genus. In re Slayter, 276 F.2d 408, 411, 125 USPQ 345, 347 (CCPA 1960); In re Gosteli, 872 F.2d 1008, 10 USPQ2d 1614 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

The combined teaching of Manico in view of Kendrick and further in view of Tashiro et al. as discussed and analyzed in claim 1 teaches the mounting point being a front mounting point (See Manico, fig. 1).

Regarding claim 5, claim 5 is written in a Markush type by using the expression "mounting assembly is selected from the group consisting of a suction cup mounting assembly a multi-purpose suction cup mounting assembly, a multi-purpose flat mounting assembly, a clip-on suction cup mounting assembly and a bracket mounting assembly", meeting one species of a genus family anticipates the claimed subject matter. "A generic claim cannot be allowed to an applicant if the prior art discloses a species falling within the claimed genus." The species in that case will anticipate the genus. In re Slayter, 276 F.2d 408, 411, 125 USPQ 345, 347 (CCPA 1960); In re Gosteli, 872 F.2d 1008, 10 USPQ2d 1614 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

The combined teaching of Manico in view of Kendrick and further in view of Tashiro et al. as discussed and analyzed in claim 1 teaches the mounting point being a front mounting point (Manico and Kendrick teach the use of suction cups). Grounds for rejecting claim 1 apply here.

Regarding claim 6, limitations can be found in claim 1.

Regarding claim 8, limitations can be found in claim 1.

Regarding claim 9, claim 9 is written in a Markush type by using the expression "network is a network selected from the group consisting of a power line network, a wireless network, an acoustic network, a wired network, the Internet, a Local Area Network, a Wide Area Network, and an optic network", meeting one species of a genus family anticipates the claimed subject matter. "A generic claim cannot be allowed to an applicant if the prior art discloses a species falling within the claimed genus." The species in that case will anticipate the genus. In re Slayter, 276 F.2d 408, 411, 125 USPQ 345, 347 (CCPA 1960); In re Gosteli, 872 F.2d 1008, 10 USPQ2d 1614 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

The combined teaching of Manico in view of Kendrick and further in view of Tashiro et al. as discussed and analyzed in claim 1 teaches that the network can be the Internet (Tashiro et al., col. 9, lines 47-67).

Regarding claim 11, claim 11 is written in a Markush type by using the expression "image sensor is powered from a power source selected from the group consisting of solar power, battery power, AC power, and DC power", meeting one species of a genus family anticipates the claimed subject matter. "A generic claim

cannot be allowed to an applicant if the prior art discloses a species falling within the claimed genus.” The species in that case will anticipate the genus. In re Slayter, 276 F.2d 408, 411, 125 USPQ 345, 347 (CCPA 1960); In re Gosteli, 872 F.2d 1008, 10 USPQ2d 1614 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

The combined teaching of Manico in view of Kendrick and further in view of Tashiro et al. as discussed and analyzed in claim 1 teaches that the image sensor is powered with the power of the vehicle (this teaches the use of DC power).

Regarding claim 14, limitations can be found in claim 1.

Regarding claim 15, the combined teaching of Manico in view of Kendrick and further in view of Tashiro et al. as discussed and analyzed in claim 1 teaches that the low profile housing further comprises a glare shield (See Manico, exposure chamber 44 as shown in fig. 1 also working as a glare shield circumscribed by the opening), the glare shield circumscribed by the opening (in Manico, the exposure chamber 44 is circumscribed by the opening as shown in fig. 1), and wherein the mounting assembly is adapted for flush mounting the glare shield in direct contact with a transparent medium (See Manico, fig. 1; col. 1, line 48 – col. 3, line 8).

Regarding claim 16, limitations can be found in claim 1.

Regarding claim 18, claim 18 is written in a Markush type by using the expression “network interface is connected to a device selected from the group consisting of a bridge, a hub, a switch, a router, a gateway, and a power adapter”, meeting one species of a genus family anticipates the claimed subject matter. “A generic claim cannot be allowed to an applicant if the prior art discloses a species falling

within the claimed genus.” The species in that case will anticipate the genus. In re Slayter, 276 F.2d 408, 411, 125 USPQ 345, 347 (CCPA 1960); In re Gosteli, 872 F.2d 1008, 10 USPQ2d 1614 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Although the combined teaching of Manico in view of Kendrick and further in view of Tashiro et al. as discussed and analyzed in claim 1 fails to disclose what type of network interface is used to communicate the images to a remote user, Official Notice is taken that the use of bridges, hubs, switches, routers, gateways and power adapters are notoriously well known in the art as network interfaces used to transmit image data to a remote user through a network. Since Tashiro et al. discloses the use of internet and servers to communicate the image data to a remote user, one of an ordinary skill in the art would recognize the need of a network interface to transmit said image data to a remote user on a network and would find obvious to select from the available types of networks interface in order to perform a proper communication between different devices in a network.

Regarding claim 20, limitations can be found in claim 18.

Regarding claim 22, the combined teaching of Manico in view of Kendrick and further in view of Tashiro et al. as discussed and analyzed in claim 1 teaches that the low profile camera housing further comprises a storage device (Tashiro et al., fig. 9: 44) for storing images received by the video sensor assembly (Tashiro et al., col. 9, lines 46-56).

Regarding claim 24, limitations can be found in claim 1.

Regarding claim 25, limitations can be found in claim 1.

Regarding claim 26, the combined teaching of Manico in view of Kendrick and further in view of Tashiro et al. teaches the same as discussed and analyzed in claim 1.

7. Claim 7 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Manico et al., US Patent 5,9047,330 and Kendrick, US Patent 6,175,300 B1 in view of Tashiro et al., US Patent 6,705,774 B2 and further in view of Novak, US 2002/0141657 A1.

Regarding claim 7, the combined teaching of Manico in view of Kendrick and further in view of Tashiro et al. fails to teach that the video sensor assembly is electronically remotely adjustable via sensor resolution and wide-angle optics.

However, Novak teaches a system for controlling a web-cam transmission wherein a web-cam capable of capturing images of a wide field (i.e. using wide angle lens) stores the images in a memory and said images are processes so that a remote user can control the field of view by performing simulated pan and tilt functions wherein the user is observing a portion of the image and if wants to see a different portion of the image, the processor send a different portion of the image (This also teaches adjusting the field of view using sensor resolution since only a portion of the whole resolution of the sensor is transmitted) so that there is not need to have pan and tilt motors controlling a camera movement (Page 1, ¶ 0006 and 0023; page 2, ¶ 0024; page 3, ¶ 0036 and 0043).

Therefore, taking the combined teaching of Manico and Kendrick in view of Tashiro et al. and further in view of Novak as a whole, it would have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Manico, Kendrick, and Tashiro et al. by having the video sensor assembly is electronically remotely adjustable via sensor resolution and wide angle optics. The motivation to do so would have been to avoid the use of motors to control the pan and tilt function as suggested by Novak (Page 2, ¶0024).

8. Claims 10, 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Manico et al., US Patent 5,9047,330 and Kendrick, US Patent 6,175,300 B1 in view of Tashiro et al., US Patent 6,705,774 B2 and further in view of Schnell, US Patent 6,768,868 B1.

Regarding claim 10, the combined teaching of Manico in view of Kendrick and further in view of Tashiro et al. fails to teach that the housing is weatherproof.

However, the use of waterproof housings for cameras is notoriously well known in the art as taught by Schnell. Schnell teaches a housing (Fig. 7: 702) for a camera (See fig. 7, said housing being waterproof so that the camera can be outdoors while being protected from the weather changes (Col. 5, line 54 – col. 6, line 10; see also col. 2, lines 50-65).

Therefore, taking the combined teaching of Manico and Kendrick in view of Tashiro et al. and further in view of Schnell as a whole, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the housing in Manico, Kendrick and Tashiro et al. by having a housing being weatherproof. The motivation to do so would have been to improve the housing so it can protect the

camera and inside camera components form the weather and temperature changes as suggested by Schnell (Col. 2, lines 50-65).

Regarding claim 12, the combined teaching of Manico and Kendrick in view of Tashiro et al. and further in view of Schnell as discussed and analyzed in claim 10 teaches that a back cover is connected to the rear of said housing (See Schnell, back cover 703b in fig. 7).

Regarding claim 13, the combined teaching of Manico and Kendrick in view of Tashiro et al. and further in view of Schnell as discussed and analyzed in claim 10 teaches that the back cover contains a mounting point that connects the mounting assembly (in Schnell, back cover 103b is mounted to the camera so the camera can be flush mounted to a tree, post, or other mounting surface; col. 3, lines 33-43).

9. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Manico et al., US Patent 5,9047,330 and Kendrick, US Patent 6,175,300 B1 in view of Tashiro et al., US Patent 6,705,774 B2 and further in view of Ward, US Patent 6,784,924 B2.

Regarding claim 19, the combined teaching of Manico in view of Kendrick and further in view of Tashiro et al. fails to teach that said network interface is connected to a network device wherein said network device converts from one protocol to another protocol.

However, Ward teaches a camera comprising a network interface (Fig. 1: 32) to transmit the captured image data through a network allowing a user to send the image

data to different locations such as personal home pages in the World Wide Web, cellular phones, kiosks, etc. without having to connect the camera to a computer to send the image data; Ward also discloses that the interface may connect to a variety of known networks, such as a public switched telephone network (PSTN), ISDN, an RF cellular phone network, or Ethernet (col. 2, lines 39-59)), (This teaches connecting to a network device wherein said network device converts from one protocol to another, since the image data may be transferred to a telephone or a web page, the protocol between devices changes) (Col. 2, lines 38-58; col. 3, line 16 – col. 4, line 19).

Therefore, taking the combined teaching of Manico and Kendrick in view of Tashiro et al. and further in view of Ward as a whole, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the interface in Manico, Kendrick and Tashiro et al. by having said network interface connected to a network device wherein said network device converts from one protocol to another protocol. The motivation to do so would have been to allow the user to send the image data to different locations such as personal home pages in the World Wide Web, cellular phones, kiosks, etc. without having to connect the camera to a computer to send the image data.

10. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Manico et al., US Patent 5,9047,330 and Kendrick, US Patent 6,175,300 B1 in view of Tashiro et al., US Patent 6,705,774 B2 and further in view of Strandwitz, US 2003/0112335 A1.

Regarding claim 21, the combined teaching of Manico in view of Kendrick and further in view of Tashiro et al. fails to teach that the network interface further comprises a bandwidth allocation system.

However, Strandwitz teaches a wireless camera (See fig. 2) that transmit images through a network, wherein said camera comprises a bandwidth allocation system (See fig. 2: 190) used to find a proportion of available bandwidth in a connection serving a plurality of camera so as to define percentage of allocation of bandwidth for a given camera or from one camera to another (Page 2, ¶0028, page 3, ¶ 0035; page 5, ¶ 0063).

Therefore, taking the combined teaching of Manico and Kendrick in view of Tashiro et al. and further in view of Strandwitz as a whole, it would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Manico, Kendrick and Tashiro et al. by having a bandwidth allocation system to communicate in a network. The motivation to do so would have been to properly define a portion of the bandwidth to interact to transmit the images or interact with multiple terminals in the network and to receive a proper amount of bandwidth as required by the camera when transmitting image data.

Conclusion

11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Contact

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nelson D. Hernandez whose telephone number is (571) 272-7311. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30 A.M. to 6:00 P.M..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lin Ye can be reached on (571) 272-7372. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Nelson D. Hernandez
Examiner
Art Unit 2622

NDHH
September 4, 2007

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Lin Ye', with a stylized, flowing script.

LIN YE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER